

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated July 12, 2011.

Support for the claims may be found variously throughout the specification.

No new matter has been added.

Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Priority

i. Paragraph 1 of the Office Action requests a certified copy of the PCT application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

In response, the instant application is in the national stage (35 U.S.C. 371) of International Application PCT/IN04/00020.

The Notice of Acceptance of Application Under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 C.F.R. 1.495 in present application, having a mail date of April 24, 2009, indicates that the above identified international application has met the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 371, and is accepted for national patentability examination in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Furthermore, the Office Action fails to identify the presence of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 within the Declaration for the instant application.

Withdrawal of this demand for a certified copy of the PCT application is respectfully requested.

Allowable subject matter

ii. Paragraph 6 of the Office Action indicates allowable subject matter in claims 2-3.

Appreciation is expressed for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-3.


Claims 2-3 have been amended to place these claims into better form.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim rejection

iii. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Figure 1 of the instant specification is provided hereinbelow.



While not conceding the propriety of the rejection and in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, claim 5 has been amended.

Specifically, claim 5 includes *a model database, information about each element defined in the model being stored in the model database.*

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

iv. Paragraph 5 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073119 (Richard).

While not conceding the propriety of the rejection and in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended.

A. New non-final Office Action.

If the allowance of the claims is not forthcoming at the very least and a new grounds of rejection is made at least against the claims, then a new non-final Office Action is respectfully requested at least for the reasons provided hereinbelow.

1. Claims 1 and 4.

Claim 1 has claim 4 dependent thereon.


Claim 1 is drawn to a method for transforming a heterogeneous compound document to a desired format based on a prescribed model comprising the steps of:

- (i) specifying components of the heterogeneous compound document as a hierarchical tree structure in multiple formats and specifying input sources of information for each of the components as part of said prescribed model;
- (ii) verifying and composing the heterogeneous compound document using a modeling language parser and a document composer by dynamically obtaining input information from the input sources of information specified in said prescribed model; and
- (iii) converting the heterogeneous compound document to the desired format using the document composer.

a) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0073119 (Richard).

Figure 4 of Richard is provided hereinbelow for convenience.

E-commerce application



Claim 1 is drawn to a method for transforming a heterogeneous compound document to a desired format based on a prescribed model that includes, *inter alia*, a step of (i) specifying components of the heterogeneous compound document as a hierarchical tree structure in multiple formats and specifying input sources of information for each of the components as part of said prescribed model.

Here, Figure 4 of Richard shows an example of an electronic commerce application in which a converter 440 is integrated within a tier type architecture in which each tier has a well-defined responsibility (Richard at [0057]).

Paragraph [0049] of Richard discloses the following:

[0049] According to preferred implementations of the invention, the content of Web sites may be automatically translated using an appropriate script written in the conversion language to "blindly" process a large number of Web sites. These implementations may employ an ECMAScript interpreter, a tier architecture, an SGML parser and dynamic tree-to-tree transformations. The tier architecture is used to control multiple target requests, grouping and organizing responses into markup documents. The SGML parser can provide fault-tolerant analysis of markup documents to make them conform to XML standards. The SGML parser can generate the tree of the resulting document as a dynamic mode representing the content of the original data. Dynamic tree-to-tree transformation is provided in general via a "template/match/select" script, and also by introducing other tools (ECMAScript interpreter, regular expression search, direct access to nodes by DOM navigation, transformation and service environment).

Here, Richard is directed to converting input data of any one of a plurality of mark up formats to output data in any one of a plurality of mark up formats. The conversion method employs ECMAScript interpreter, a tier architecture, an SGML parser, and a dynamic tree-to-tree transformations. The tree-to-tree transformations may be carried out via a "template/match/select"

script, and may also use tools such as ECMAScript interpreter, a regular expression search, and direct access to nodes by DOM navigation.

However, Richard fails to disclose or suggest about converting input data of any one of a plurality of mark up formats to output data in any one of a plurality of mark up formats based on a prescribed model, and specifying the input sources of different components of such input data of plurality of mark up formats as part of said prescribed model, as required by the claimed invention.

Therefore, in the absence of any showing or suggestion in the cited reference regarding a prescribed model, the amended independent the claims are allowable.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

2. Claim 5.

Claim 5 is drawn to a system for specifying, verifying, dynamically composing and transforming a heterogeneous compound document based on a prescribed model, the system comprising:

a modeling language for depicting the structure of a compound document in one or more formats as a hierarchical tree structure and specifying the information source for each component of the document, providing a root element describing root nodes which are at the top of the structure, an internal node element representing the internal nodes of the compound document and a leaf element representing the leaf nodes of the bottom the structure;

a modeling language parser for parsing the models created using the modeling language, analysing the given model, checking whether the given model conforms to the modeling language syntax and creating an internal representation of the model elements;

a model database, information about each element defined in the model being stored in the model database;

a stream module for obtaining data dynamically from different sources specified in the stream specification in a model for composing compound document; and

a document composer for composing the document in the format specified by the model using information from the model database and obtain input from multiple sources using the stream module and performing transformation on the composed document to convert it into any other format specified in the model.

a) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0073119 (Richard).

Claim 5 is drawn to a system for specifying, verifying, dynamically composing and transforming a heterogeneous compound document based on a prescribed model.

Here, however, Richard fails to disclose or suggest specifying and verifying input data based on a prescribed model.

Hence, in the absence of said feature of the claimed invention in the cited reference, independent claim 5 is also allowable.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Official Notice, if any

There is no concession as to the veracity of Official Notice, if taken in any Office Action.

An affidavit or document should be provided in support of any Official Notice taken. 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2), M.P.E.P. §2144.03. See also, *Ex parte Natale*, 11 USPQ2d 1222, 1227-1228

(Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)(failure to provide any objective evidence to support the challenged use of Official Notice constitutes clear and reversible error).

Conclusion

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

Dated: October 12, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Brian K. Dutton

Registration No.: 47,255

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant